arXiv:1206.2629v1 [math.AP] 12 Jun 2012

Regularity of the extremal solutions associated to some elliptic systems

Craig Cowan
Department of Mathematical Sciences
University of Alabama in Huntsville
258A Shelby Center
Huntsville, AL 35899
ctcowan@stanford.edu

Mostafa Fazly*
Department of Mathematics
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver BC Canada V6T 1Z2
fazly@math.ubc.ca

March 8, 2013

Abstract

We examine the two elliptic systems given by

$$(G)_{\lambda,\gamma} \quad -\Delta u = \lambda f'(u) g(v), \quad -\Delta v = \gamma f(u) g'(v) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and

$$(H)_{\lambda,\gamma} \quad -\Delta u = \lambda f(u) g'(v), \quad -\Delta v = \gamma f'(u) g(v) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

with zero Dirichlet boundary conditions and where λ, γ are positive parameters. We show that for arbitrary nonlinearities f and g that the extremal solutions associated with $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ are bounded provided Ω is a convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ where $N \le 3$. In the case of a radial domain we show the extremal solutions are bounded provided $N < 10$.

The extremal solutions associated with $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ are bounded in the case where f is arbitrary, $g(v) = (v+1)^q$ where $1 < q < \infty$ and where Ω is a bounded convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \le 3$.

Results are also obtained in higher dimensions for $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ and $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ for the case of explicit nonlinearities of the form $f(u) = (u+1)^p$ and $g(v) = (v+1)^q$.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.
Key words: Elliptic system, Extremal solution, Stable solution, Regularity of solutions.

1 Introduction

In this work we examine the following systems:

$$(G)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda f'(u) g(v) & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &=& \gamma f(u) g'(v) & \Omega, \\ u &=& v = 0 & \partial\Omega \end{array} \right.$$

and

---

*This work is supported by a University Graduate Fellowship and is part of the second author's Ph.D. dissertation in preparation under the supervision of Professor N. Ghoussoub.

$$(H)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda f(u) g'(v) & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &=& \gamma f'(u) g(v) & \Omega, \\ u &=& v = 0 & \partial\Omega \end{array} \right.$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $\lambda, \gamma > 0$ are positive parameters. The nonlinearities f and g will satisfy various properties but will always at least satisfy

(R) f is smooth, increasing and convex with $f(0) = 1$ and f superlinear at ∞.

We begin by recalling the scalar analog of the above systems.

Given a nonlinearity f which satisfies (R), the following equation

$$(Q)_\lambda \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda f(u) & \Omega \\ u &=& 0 & \partial\Omega \end{array} \right.$$

is now quite well understood whenever Ω is a bounded smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$. See, for instance, [2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 1]. We now list the properties one comes to expect when studying $(Q)_\lambda$. It is well known that there exists a critical parameter $\lambda^* \in (0, \infty)$, called the extremal parameter, such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ there exists a smooth, minimal solution u_λ of $(Q)_\lambda$. Here minimal solution means in the pointwise sense. In addition for each $x \in \Omega$ the map $\lambda \mapsto u_\lambda(x)$ is increasing in $(0, \lambda^*)$. This allows one to define the pointwise limit $u^*(x) := \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \lambda^*} u_\lambda(x)$ which can be shown to be a weak solution, in a suitably defined sense, of $(Q)_{\lambda^*}$. For this reason u^* is called the extremal solution. It is also known that for $\lambda > \lambda^*$ there are no weak solutions of $(Q)_\lambda$. Also one can show the minimal solution u_λ is a semi-stable solution of $(Q)_\lambda$ in the sense that

$$\int_\Omega \lambda f'(u_\lambda) \psi^2 \le \int_\Omega |\nabla \psi|^2, \qquad \forall\, \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega).$$

A question that has attracted a lot of attention is the regularity of the extremal solution. It is known that the extremal solution can be a classical solution or it can be a singular weak solution. We now list some results in this direction:

- ([7]) u^* is bounded if $f(u) = e^u$ and $N \le 9$.
- ([14]) u^* is bounded if f satisfies (R) and $N \le 3$.
- ([3]) u^* is bounded if f satisfies (R) (can drop the convexity assumption) and Ω a convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^4$.
- ([4]) u^* is bounded if Ω is a radial domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N < 10$ and f satisfies (R) (can drop the convexity assumption).

It is precisely these type of results which we are interested in extending to the case of systems. Before we can discuss the regularity of the extremal solutions associated with $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ and $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ we need to introduce some notation.

Under various conditions on f and g the above systems fit into the general framework of developed in [13], who examined a generalization of

$$(P)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda F(u,v) & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &=& \gamma G(u,v) & \Omega, \\ u &=& v = 0 & \partial\Omega. \end{array} \right.$$

The following results are all taken from [13]. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \{(\lambda, \gamma) : \lambda, \gamma > 0\}$ and we define

$$\mathcal{U} := \{(\lambda, \gamma) \in \mathcal{Q} : \text{ there exists a smooth solution } (u,v) \text{ of } (P)_{\lambda,\gamma}\}.$$

Firstly we assume that $F(0,0), G(0,0) > 0$. A simple argument shows that if F is superlinear at $u = \infty$, uniformly in v, then the set of λ in $\mathcal{U}$ is bounded. Similarly we assume that G is superlinear at $v = \infty$, uniformly in u and hence we get $\mathcal{U}$ is bounded. We also assume that F, G are increasing in each variable. This allows the use of a sub/supersolution approach and one easily sees that if $(\lambda, \gamma) \in \mathcal{U}$ then so is $(0, \lambda] \times (0, \gamma]$. One also sees that $\mathcal{U}$ is nonempty.

We now define $\Upsilon := \partial\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Q}$, which plays the role of the extremal parameter λ^*. Various properties of Υ are known, see [13]. Given $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ set $\sigma := \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*} \in (0, \infty)$ and define

$$\Gamma_\sigma := \{(\lambda, \lambda\sigma) : \frac{\lambda^*}{2} < \lambda < \lambda^*\}.$$

We let (u_λ, v_λ) denote the minimal solution $(P)_{\lambda,\sigma\lambda}$ for $\frac{\lambda^*}{2} < \lambda < \lambda^*$. One easily sees that for each $x \in \Omega$ that $u_\lambda(x), v_\lambda(x)$ are increasing in λ and hence we define

$$u^*(x) := \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \lambda^*} u_\lambda(x), \quad v^*(x) := \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \lambda^*} v_\lambda(x),$$

and we call (u^*, v^*) the extremal solution associated with $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$. Under some very minor growth assumptions on F and G one can show that (u^*, v^*) is a weak solution of $(P)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$.

We now come to the issue of stability.

Theorem A. *[13] Let $(\lambda, \gamma) \in \mathcal{U}$ and let (u, v) denote the minimal solution of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$. Then (u, v) is semi-stable in the sense that there is some smooth $0 < \zeta, \chi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $0 \le \eta$ such that*

$$-\Delta\zeta = \lambda F_u(u,v)\zeta + \lambda F_v(u,v)\chi + \eta\zeta, \qquad -\Delta\chi = \gamma G_u(u,v)\zeta + \gamma G_v(u,v)\chi + \eta\chi, \qquad \Omega. \tag{1}$$

In this paper we prove that the extremal solution of $(G)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$ with general nonlinearities, either on a general domain and lower dimensions or on a radial domain and higher dimensions are regular. Moreover, for explicit nonlinearites we prove regularity on a general domain in higher dimensions.

The following stability inequalities play a key role in this paper and we shall refer to them many times through proofs. We mention that in [10] the De Giorgi type results and Liouville theorems have been proved for a much more general gradient system and they obtained a stability inequality which reduces to (2) in the particular case we are examining. Note that some of our results will hold for a general gradient system that is examined in [10].

Lemma 1. *1. Let (u, v) denote a semi-stable solution of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ in the sense of (1). Then*

$$\int f''(u)g(v)\phi^2 + \int f(u)g''(v)\psi^2 + 2\int f'(u)g'(v)\phi\psi \le \frac{1}{\lambda}\int |\nabla\phi|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\int |\nabla\psi|^2. \tag{2}$$

2. Let (u, v) denote a semi-stable solution of $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ in the sense of (1). Then

$$\int f'(u)g'(v)(\phi^2 + \psi^2) + 2\int \sqrt{ff''gg''}\phi\psi \le \frac{1}{\lambda}\int |\nabla\phi|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\int |\nabla\psi|^2. \tag{3}$$

Proof. (1) By Theorem A there is some $0 < \zeta, \chi$ such that

$$-\Delta\zeta \ge \lambda f''(u)g(v)\zeta + \lambda f'(u)g'(v)\chi \quad \text{and} \quad -\Delta\chi \ge \gamma f'(u)g'(v)\zeta + \gamma f(u)g''(v)\chi \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

.

Consider test functions $\phi, \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and multiply both sides of the above inequalities with $\frac{\phi^2}{\zeta}$ and $\frac{\psi^2}{\chi}$ to obtain

$$-\int |\nabla\phi|^2 \frac{\zeta^2}{\phi^2} + 2\int \nabla\phi \cdot \nabla\zeta\, \frac{\zeta}{\phi} \ge \int \lambda f'(u)g'(v)\phi^2 \frac{\chi}{\zeta} + \int \lambda f(u)g''(v)\phi^2,$$

$$-\int |\nabla\psi|^2 \frac{\chi^2}{\psi^2} + 2\int \nabla\psi \cdot \nabla\chi\, \frac{\chi}{\psi} \ge \int \gamma f(u)g''(v)\psi^2 + \int \gamma f'(u)g'(v)\psi^2 \frac{\zeta}{\chi}.$$

Apply Young's inequality for the left hand side of each inequality and add them to get

$$\lambda \int f''(u)g(v)\phi^2 + \gamma \int f(u)g''(v)\psi^2 + \int f'(u)g'(v) \left(\lambda \phi^2 \frac{\chi}{\zeta} + \gamma \psi^2 \frac{\zeta}{\chi}\right) \leq \int |\nabla \phi|^2 + \int |\nabla \psi|^2,$$

Simple calculations show that the third term is an upper bound for

$$2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma} \int f'(u)g'(v)\phi\psi.$$

Then, replacing ϕ with $\frac{\phi}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$ and ψ with $\frac{\psi}{\sqrt{\gamma}}$ gives the desired result.

(2) Proof is quiet similar to (1). By Theorem A there is some $0 < \zeta, \chi$ such that

$$-\frac{\Delta\zeta}{\zeta} \geq \lambda f'(u)g'(v) + \lambda f(u)g''(v)\frac{\chi}{\zeta} \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{\Delta\chi}{\chi} \geq \gamma f''(u)g(v)\frac{\zeta}{\chi} + \gamma f'(u)g'(v) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and we now multiply the first equation by ϕ^2 and the second by ψ^2 and add the equations and integrate over Ω. In addition we use the fact that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{-\Delta E}{E}\phi^2 \leq \int |\nabla\phi|^2,$$

for any $E > 0$ and $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Doing this one obtains

$$\int_\Omega f'(u)g'(v)(\lambda\phi^2 + \gamma\psi^2) + \int_\Omega \lambda f(u)g''(v)\phi^2\frac{\chi}{\zeta} + \gamma f''(u)g(v)\psi^2\frac{\zeta}{\chi} \leq \int_\Omega |\nabla\phi|^2 + |\nabla\psi|^2.$$

Again some simple algebra shows that

$$2\sqrt{\lambda\gamma} \int_\Omega \sqrt{f(u)f''(u)g(v)g''(v)}\phi\psi,$$

is a lower bound for the second integral. Using this lower bound and replacing ϕ with $\frac{\phi}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$ and ψ with $\frac{\psi}{\sqrt{\gamma}}$ finishes the proof.

□

In Section 2, we explore the regularity of extremal solutions for systems $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ and $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ with arbitrary nonlinearities and, in then Section 3 we consider explicit nonlinearities. We finish the current section by this point that in [5] the system

$$(E)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda e^v & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &=& \gamma e^u & \Omega, \\ u &=& v = 0 & \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

was examined. It was shown that if Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ where $N \leq 9$, then the extremal solution (u^*, v^*) associated with $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ is bounded if

$$\frac{N-2}{8} < \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*} < \frac{8}{N-2}.$$

Note that as one gets closer to the diagonal parameter range $\gamma = \lambda$ that better regularity results are obtained. At the diagonal the system can be shown to reduce to the scalar equation $-\Delta u = \lambda e^u$. This phenomena will also be present in Section 3 where we consider explicit nonlinearities.

2 Arbitrary nonlinearities

We begin by examining $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ in the case of arbitrary nonlinearities and we show the extremal solutions are bounded in low dimensions and our methods of proof are close to [14].

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Ω is a bounded smooth convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ where $N \le 3$ and suppose f and g both satisfy condition (R). We also assume that $a := f'(0) > 0$ and $b := g'(0) > 0$. In addition we assume that f', g' are convex and there is some $\xi > 0$ such that*

$$\liminf_{u\to\infty} \frac{f''(u)}{u^{\xi}} > 0, \qquad \liminf_{v\to\infty} \frac{g''(v)}{v^{\xi}} > 0. \tag{4}$$

Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$. Then the associated extremal solution of $(G)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$ is bounded.

For radial domains we obtain similar results but in higher dimensions and our methods of proof follow very closely to [4] and [15].

Theorem 2. *Let $\Omega = B_1$, $N \ge 3$, and f and g both satisfy condition (R) and in addition we assume that there is some $\xi > 0$ such that*

$$\liminf_{u\to\infty} \frac{f'(u)}{u^{1+\xi}} > 0, \quad \liminf_{v\to\infty} \frac{g'(v)}{v^{1+\xi}} > 0.$$

Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ and let (u^*, v^*) denote the extremal solution associated with $(G)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$. Then

1. *if $N < 10$, then $u^*, v^* \in L^\infty(B_1)$,*
2. *if $N = 10$, then $u^*(r), v^*(r) \le C_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(1 + |\log r|)$ for $r \in (0, 1]$,*
3. *if $N > 10$, then $u^*(r), v^*(r) \le C_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*,N} r^{-\frac{N}{2}+\sqrt{N-1}+2}$ for $r \in (0, 1]$.*

We are unable to prove the analogous version for the system $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ and hence we restrict our attention to the special case.

Theorem 3. *Suppose Ω a bounded smooth convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $1 < q < \infty$. Assume f satisfies (R) and we also assume that $f'' \ge C > 0$. Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$. Then the associated extremal solution of $(H)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$ for $g(v) = (1 + v)^q$ is bounded.*

The following lemma is used to prove Theorem 1 where a convex domain is assumed but we prove the lemma for general domains.

Lemma 2. *Suppose Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and f and g satisfy the conditions from Theorem 1 but one can weaken condition (4) to $f'', g'' \to \infty$ at ∞. Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ and let (u^*, v^*) denote the extremal solution associated with $(G)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$. Then there is some $C < \infty$ such that*

$$(i) \int f'(u^*)g'(v^*)(f'(u^*) - a)(g'(v^*) - b) \le C, \quad (ii) \int (f'(u^*) - a)f''(u^*)g(v^*) \le C,$$

$$(iii) \int (g'(v^*) - b)g''(v^*)f(u^*) \le C.$$

Remark 1. *Let f_i, g_i denote smooth increasing nonlinearities with $f_i(0), g_i(0) > 0$ and we also assume there is some $\xi > 0$ such*

$$\liminf_{u\to\infty} \frac{f_1(u)}{u^{1+\xi}} > 0, \qquad \liminf_{v\to\infty} \frac{g_2(v)}{v^{1+\xi}} > 0. \tag{5}$$

Let (u_m, v_m) denote a sequence of smooth solutions of $(P)_{\lambda_m,\sigma\lambda_m}$, where $0 < \sigma < \infty$ is fixed and λ_m is restricted to a compact subset of $(0, \infty)$ and $F(u, v) = f_1(u)g_1(u)$, $G(u, v) = f_2(u)g_2(v)$. Then we have the estimate

$$\int f_1(u_m)g_1(v_m)\delta + \int f_2(u_m)g_2(v_m)\delta \le C,$$

where $\delta(x) := dist(x, \partial\Omega)$. Applying regularity theory shows that u_m, v_m are bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$.

On occasion we will restrict our attention to smooth convex domains where many of the proofs are much more compact. For this we will use a result proven using the Moving Plane Method. So we assume that Ω is a smooth convex domain. Then there is some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small such that any smooth solution (u, v) of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ satisfies some monotonicity properties in in the small strip $\{x \in \Omega : \delta(x) \leq \varepsilon_0\}$ near the boundary. (Essentially one can assume u, v are strictly decreasing as one approaches the boundary). This coupled with the L^1 bounds on u_m and v_m shows that there is some constant C_0 such that $u_m, v_m \leq C_0$ on some small strip, say $\{x \in \Omega : \delta(x) \leq \varepsilon_1\}$ near the boundary. Assuming the same restrictions on λ_m, γ_m one can use the maximum principle to show that there is some $C_1 > 0$ such that $u_m, v_m \geq C_1$ in the compliment of this small strip.

Proof. All integrals are over Ω unless otherwise stated. Our approach will be to obtain uniform estimates for any minimal solution (u, v) of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ on the ray Γ_σ and then one sends $\lambda \nearrow \lambda^*$ to obtain the same estimate for (u^*, v^*). Let (u, v) denote a smooth minimal solution of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ on the ray Γ_σ and put $\phi := f'(u) - a$ and $\psi := g'(v) - b$ into (2) to obtain

$$\int f''(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a)^2 + \int f(u)g''(v)(g'(v)-b)^2 + 2\int f'(u)g'(v)(f'(u)-a)(g'(v)-b),$$

is less than or equal

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\int \nabla(f'(u)-a)f''(u)\cdot\nabla u + \frac{1}{\gamma}\int \nabla(g'(v)-b)g''(v)\cdot\nabla v. \tag{6}$$

Integrating (6) by parts shows that this is equal to

$$\frac{-1}{\lambda}\int (f'(u)-a)f'''(u)|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\int (f'(u)-a)f''(u)(-\Delta u),$$

plus a similar term in involving v. We use the equation $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ to replace $-\Delta u$ and $-\Delta v$ in the last line and simplify to arrive at

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\int (f'(u)-a)f'''(u)|\nabla u|^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\int (g'(v)-b)g'''(v)|\nabla v|^2 + 2\int f'(u)g'(v)(f'(u)-a)(g'(v)-b),$$

is less than or equal to

$$a\int f''(u)(f'(u)-a)g(v) + b\int g''(v)(g'(v)-b)f(u).$$

We now define $h_1(u) := \int_0^u (f'(t)-a)f'''(t)dt$ and $h_2(v) := \int_0^v (g'(t)-b)g'''(t)dt$. Subbing this into the previous inequality and integrating by parts and using $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ again we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \int h_1(u)f'(u)g(v) + \int h_2(v)f(u)g'(v) & \\ +2\int f'(u)g'(v)(f'(u)-a)(g'(v)-b) &\leq a\int f''(u)(f'(u)-a)g(v) \\ &\quad +b\int g''(v)(g'(v)-b)f(u) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Now suppose $u > \alpha > 0$. Then we have

$$h_1(u) \geq \int_\alpha^u (f'(t)-a)f'''(t)dt \geq (f'(\alpha)-a)(f''(u)-f''(\alpha)),$$

and so using the condition on $f''(u)$ we see that

$$\liminf_{u\to\infty} \frac{h_1(u)}{f''(u)} \geq f'(\alpha) - a,$$

for any $\alpha > 0$. But since f is convex and superlinear at infinity we see that $\lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{h_1(u)}{f''(u)} = \infty$. Similarly $\lim_{v\to\infty} \frac{h_2(v)}{g''(v)} = \infty$.

We now estimate the integral $\int f''(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a)$. There is some $T > 1$ large such that for all $u \ge T$ we have $h_1(u) \ge 100(a+1)f''(u)$ for all $u \ge T$. Then we have

$$\int f''(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a) = \int_{u\ge T} + \int_{u<T} \le \frac{1}{100(a+1)} \int h_1(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a) + \int_{u<T} \int f''(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a).$$

We now estimate this last integral. Let T be as above and fixed and we let $k \ge 1$ denote a natural number.

$$\int_{u<T} f''(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a) = \int_{u<T,v<kT} + \int_{u<T,v\ge kT} = C(k,T) + \int_{u<T,v\ge kT} f''(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a)$$

and we now estimate this last integral. One easily sees that this last integral is bounded above by

$$\sup_{u<T} \frac{f''(u)}{f'(u)} \sup_{v>kT} \frac{g(v)}{(g'(v)-b)g'(v)} \int (f'(u)-a)(g'(v)-b)f'(u)g'(v).$$

Combining this all together we see that for all sufficiently large T and all $1 \le k$ there is some constant $C(k,T)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int f''(u)g(v)(f'(u)-a) \quad &\le \quad \frac{1}{100(a+1)} \int h_1(u)f'(u)g(v) + C(k,T) \\ &\quad + \sup_{u<T} \frac{f''(u)}{f'(u)} \sup_{v>kT} \frac{g(v)}{(g'(v)-b)g'(v)} \int (f'(u)-a)(g'(v)-b)f'(u)g'(v).\end{aligned}$$

Using the same argument one can show for all sufficiently large T and for all $1 \le k$ there is some $C(k,T)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int g''(v)f(u)(g'(v)-b) \quad &\le \quad \frac{1}{100(b+1)} \int h_2(v)g'(v)f(u) + C(k,T) \\ &\quad + \sup_{v<T} \frac{g''(v)}{g'(v)} \sup_{u>kT} \frac{f(u)}{(f'(u)-a)f'(u)} \int (f'(u)-a)(g'(v)-b)f'(u)g'(v).\end{aligned}$$

Since $f'', g'' \to \infty$ we see that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup_{u>kT} \frac{f(u)}{(f'(u)-a)f'(u)} = 0,$$

and similarly for the other term. Hence by taking k sufficiently large we can substitute everything back into (7) and see that all the integrals in (7) are bounded independant of λ.

$\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.

We assume that $N = 3$ and Ω is convex domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The case of $N = 1, 2$ is easier and we omit their proofs. We suppose that $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ and (u^*, v^*) is the associated extremal solution of $(G)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$. Set $\sigma = \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$. Using Remark 1 along with Lemma 2 we see that $f'(u^*)g'(v^*) \in L^2(\Omega)$. Note that this and the convexity of g show that

$$\int_\Omega \frac{f'(u^*)^2 g(v^*)^2}{(v^*+1)^2} \le C.$$

From Lemma 2 and Remark 1 we have $-\Delta u^*, -\Delta v^* \in L^1$ and hence we have $u^*, v^* \in L^{3-}$, ie. L^p for any $p < 3$.

We now use the domain decomposition method as in [14]. Set

$$\Omega_1 := \left\{ x : \frac{f'(u^*)^2 g(v^*)^2}{(v^*+1)^2} \ge f'(u^*)^{2-\alpha} g(v^*)^{2-\alpha} \right\},$$

$$\Omega_2 := \Omega \backslash \Omega_1 = \left\{ x : f'(u^*) g(v^*) \le (v^*+1)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}} \right\},$$

where $0 < \alpha$ is to be picked later. First note that

$$\int_{\Omega_1} (f'(u^*) g(v^*))^{2-\alpha} \le \int_{\Omega} \frac{f'(u^*)^2 g(v^*)^2}{(v^*+1)^2} \le C.$$

Similarly we have

$$\int_{\Omega_2} (f'(u^*) g(v^*))^p \le \int_{\Omega} (v^*+1)^{\frac{2p}{\alpha}}.$$

Taking $\alpha = \frac{4}{5}$ and using the L^{3-} bound on v shows that $f'(u^*)g(v^*) \in L^{\frac{6}{5}-}(\Omega)$. By a symmetry argument we also have $f(u^*)g'(v^*) \in L^{\frac{6}{5}-}(\Omega)$.

By elliptic regularity we have $u^*, v^* \in W^{2,\frac{6}{5}-}$ and this is contained in $L^{6-}(\Omega)$ after considering the Sobolev imbedding theorem. Using these estimates and again using the domain decomposition Ω_1 and Ω_2 but taking $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ gives that $f'(u^*)g(v^*) \in L^{\frac{3}{2}-}(\Omega)$ and by symmetry we have the same for $f(u^*)g'(v^*)$. Elliptic regularity now shows that $u^*, v^* \in W^{2,\frac{3}{2}-}$ and this is contained in L^p for any $p < \infty$. One last iteration with $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}$ shows that $f'(u^*)g(v^*) \in L^{\frac{7}{4}}(\Omega)$ and after considering elliptic regularity and the Sobolev imbedding we have u^* is bounded. By symmetry we see v^* is also bounded.

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ and let (u^*, v^*) denote the extremal solution associated with $(H)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$. We let (u, v) denote a minimal solution on the ray Γ_σ where $\sigma = \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$. Without loss of generality we can assume $\lambda = \sigma = 1$ to simplify the calculations. Note the assumption on f'' shows there is some $\xi > 0$ such that $\frac{f(u)}{u^{1+\xi}} \to \infty$ as $u \to \infty$. Using this along with the fact that $q > 1$ and Remark 1 shows that $\Delta u^*, \Delta v^* \in L^1(\Omega)$.

Set $\alpha := f(u) - 1$ and $\beta := (v+1)^t - 1$ where $1 < t < t_+(q) := q + \sqrt{q(q-1)}$ into the stability inequality to arrive at

$$(q - \frac{t^2}{2t-1}) \int f'(u)(v+1)^{2t+q-1} + \int (f(u)-1) f''(u) |\nabla u|^2 + 2\sqrt{q(q-1)} \int \sqrt{f(u) f''(u)} (v+1)^{q-1} (f(u)-1)((v+1)^t - 1)$$

is less than or equal to

$$2q \int f(u) f'(u)(v+1)^{q-1} + 2q \int f'(u)(v+1)^{q+t-1}.$$

We label these integrals as I_i for $1 \le i \le 5$ from left to right. The condition on t ensures the coefficient in front I_1 is positive. We can rewrite

$$I_2 = \int q h_1(u) f(u)(v+1)^{q-1}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad h_1(u) = \int_0^u (f(\tau) - 1) f''(\tau) d\tau.$$

One easily sees that $\frac{h_1(u)}{f'(u)} \to \infty$ as $u \to \infty$. Let T be sufficiently large such that $h_1(u) \ge 10 f'(u)$ for all $u \ge T$. Then one easily sees that

$$\int f(u) f'(u)(v+1)^{q-1} \le \frac{1}{10} \int h_1(u) f(u)(v+1)^{q-1} + f'(T) \int f(u)(v+1)^{q-1}.$$

We also have

$$\int f'(u)(v+1)^{q+t-1} \le T^{q+t-1} \int f'(u) + \frac{1}{T^t} \int f'(u)(v+1)^{q+2t-1},$$

and so after combining the estimates we have

$$\left(q-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}-\frac{2q}{T^t}\right)\int f'(u)(v+1)^{q+2t-1}+\frac{4q}{5}\int h_1(u)f(u)(v+1)^{q-1}+$$

$$+2\sqrt{q(q-1)}\int\sqrt{f(u)f''(u)}(v+1)^{q-1}(f(u)-1)((v+1)^t-1),$$

is less than or equal

$$2qf'(T)\int f(u)(v+1)^{q-1}+2qT^{q+t-1}\int f'(u).$$

Passing to the limit shows this inequality holds with (u^*,v^*) in place of (u,v).

But these last two integrals are finite and hence we have an estimate provided the first coefficient is positive, which is indeed the case provided we take T bigger if necessary. Hence each of the following integrals is finite

$$(i)\ \int f'(u^*)(v^*+1)^{q+2t-1},\quad (ii)\ \int f'(u^*)f(u^*)(v^*+1)^{q-1},\quad (iii)\ \int f(u^*)^{\frac{3}{2}}(v^*+1)^{q+t-1},$$

for all $1<t<t_+(q)$.

Now note that $-\Delta(f(u))=-f''(u)|\nabla u|^2+f'(u)f(u)(v+1)^{q-1}$ and since f is convex and since $f'(u)f(u)(v+1)^{q-1}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$ along the ray Γ_σ shows that $f(u)$ is uniformly bounded in $L^{\frac{N}{N-2}-}=L^{3-}$; and hence $f(u^*)\in L^{3-}$.

We now use (i) and (iii) to show that u^* is bounded. Pick $p>\frac{3}{2}$ but close and $\alpha>0$ and $1<\tau<\infty$ such that

$$(p-\alpha)\tau<3,\qquad \tau'\alpha=\frac{3}{2},\qquad (q-1)p\tau'<q-1+t_+(q).$$

Then we have

$$\int(f(u^*)(v^*+1)^{(q-1)})^p\le\left(\int f(u^*)^{(p-\alpha)\tau}\right)^{\frac{1}{\tau}}\left(\int f(u^*)^{\frac{3}{2}}(v+1)^{\tau'p(q-1)}\right)^{\frac{1}{\tau'}},$$

but the right hand side is finite and hence by elliptic regularity we have u^* is bounded. We now show that v^* is bounded. First note that we have $\int(v^*+1)^{2t+q-1}<\infty$ for any $1<t<t_+(q)$ and hence one has $\int(v^*+1)^{q+1}<\infty$. Since u^* is bounded this shows that $v^*\in H_0^1$. Now to complete the proof of v^* being bounded it is sufficient to show (since u^* is bounded) that $(v^*+1)\in L^{(q-1)p}$ for some $p>\frac{3}{2}$ but this easily follows after considering the above estimate.

□

Proof of Theorem 2. Step 1. Let (u,v) denote a smooth minimal solution of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ on the ray Γ_σ where $\sigma:=\frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$. Then taking a derivative of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ with respect to r gives

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcllll} -\Delta u_r+\frac{N-1}{r^2}u_r &=& \lambda f''(u)g(v)u_r+\lambda f'(u)g'(v)v_r & \text{for} & 0<r<1,\\ -\Delta v_r+\frac{N-1}{r^2}v_r &=& \gamma f'(u)g'(v)u_r+\gamma f(u)g''(v)v_r & \text{for} & 0<r<1.\end{array}\right. \tag{8}$$

Multiply the first and the second equations of (8) with $u_r\phi^2$ and $v_r\phi^2$ where $\phi\in C^{0,1}(B_1)\cap H_0^1(B_1)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\int|\nabla u_r|^2\phi^2+\frac{1}{2}\nabla u_r^2\cdot\phi^2+\frac{N-1}{r^2}u_r^2\phi^2 &= \int\lambda f''(u)g(v)u_r^2\phi^2+\lambda f'(u)g'(v)v_ru_r\phi^2\\ \int|\nabla v_r|^2\phi^2+\frac{1}{2}\nabla v_r^2\cdot\phi^2+\frac{N-1}{r^2}v_r^2\phi^2 &= \int\gamma f'(u)g'(v)u_rv_r\phi^2+\gamma f(u)g''(v)v_r^2\phi^2\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

On the other hand, testing (2) on $\phi\to u_r\phi$ and $\psi\to v_r\phi$ where ϕ is as above, we get

$$\int f''(u)g(v)u_r^2\phi^2+\int f(u)g''(v)v_r^2\phi^2+2\int f'(u)g'(v)u_rv_r\phi^2\le\frac{1}{\lambda}\int|\nabla(u_r\phi)|^2+\frac{1}{\gamma}\int|\nabla(v_r\phi)|^2.$$

Expanding the right hand side we get

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\int\left(|\nabla u_r|^2\phi^2+u_r^2|\nabla\phi|^2+\frac{1}{2}\nabla\phi^2\cdot\nabla u_r^2\right)+\frac{1}{\gamma}\int\left(|\nabla v_r|^2\phi^2+v_r^2|\nabla\phi|^2+\frac{1}{2}\nabla\phi^2\cdot\nabla v_r^2\right)$$

Applying (9) the above will be

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\lambda}\int u_r^2|\nabla\phi|^2+\frac{1}{\gamma}\int v_r^2|\nabla\phi|^2 \quad - \quad & \frac{N-1}{\lambda}\int u_r^2\frac{\phi^2}{r^2}-\frac{N-1}{\gamma}\int v_r^2\frac{\phi^2}{r^2} \\ & +2\int f'(u)g'(v)u_rv_r\phi^2+\int f(u)g''(v)v_r^2\phi^2+\int f''(u)g(v)u_r^2\phi^2\end{aligned}$$

Therefore one obtains, after substituting $r\phi$ for ϕ,

$$(N-1)\int\left(\frac{u_r^2}{\lambda}+\frac{v_r^2}{\gamma}\right)\phi^2\le\int\left(\frac{u_r^2}{\lambda}+\frac{v_r^2}{\gamma}\right)|\nabla(r\phi)|^2, \tag{10}$$

for all $\phi\in C^{0,1}(B_1)\cap H_0^1(B_1)$. Note that there is no f and g in this estimate.

Step 2. We show that (10) implies that $u^*,v^*\in H_0^1(B_1)$. Firstly we argue there is some $C_R>0$ such that for any $0<R<1$ we have $\sup_{r>R}(u(r)+v(r))\le C_R$ and C_R is independent of λ (and hence the estimate also holds for u^*,v^*). To see this we first note that by Remark 1 we have $\|u\|_{L^1},\|v\|_{L^1}\le C$ (uniformly in λ) and since u,v are radially decreasing we have the desired result otherwise we couldn't have the L^1 bound. We now let $0\le\phi\le1$ be a smooth function supported in B_1 with $\phi=1$ on $B_{\frac{1}{2}}$. Putting this into (10) and rearranging gives

$$(N-2)\int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{u_r^2}{\lambda}+\frac{v_r^2}{\gamma}\le C\int_{B_1\setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}}\frac{u_r^2}{\lambda}+\frac{v_r^2}{\gamma}. \tag{11}$$

Now let $0\le\psi\le1$ denote smooth function with $\psi=0$ in $B_{\frac{1}{4}}$ and $\psi=1$ for $|x|>\frac{1}{2}$. Multiply $-\Delta u=\lambda f'(u)g(v)$ by $u\psi^2$ and integrate by parts and use Young's inequality to arrive at

$$\int|\nabla u|^2\psi^2\le2\lambda\int f'(u)g(v)u\psi^2+4\int u^2|\nabla\psi|^2,$$

and hence we have

$$\int_{B_1\setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}}|\nabla u|^2\le2\lambda\int_{B_1\setminus B_{\frac{1}{4}}}f'(u)g(v)u+C\int_{B_1\setminus B_{\frac{1}{4}}}u^2 \tag{12}$$

and we now use the pointwise bound to see that

$$\int_{B_1\setminus B_{\frac{1}{2}}}|\nabla u|^2\le C,$$

where C is independant of λ. Similarly we obtain the same estimate of v and combining this with (11) we see that u,v are bounded in $H_0^1(B_1)$ indapendant of λ and hence $u^*,v^*\in H_0^1(B_1)$.

Step 3. Let (u,v) denote a minimal solution of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ on the Γ_σ where $\sigma:=\frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$.
For $0<r<\frac{1}{2}$ define ϕ to be the following test function

$$\phi(t)=\begin{cases} r^{-\sqrt{N-1}-1} & \text{if } 0\le t\le r,\\ t^{-\sqrt{N-1}-1} & \text{if } r<t\le1/2,\\ 2^{\sqrt{N-1}+2}(1-t) & \text{if } 1/2<t\le1.\end{cases}$$

Putting ϕ into (10) gives

$$\int_0^r \left(\frac{u_r^2(t)}{\lambda}+\frac{v_r^2(t)}{\gamma}\right)t^{N-1}dt \leq C_N r^{2\sqrt{N-1}+2}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}||\nabla u||^2_{L^2(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{1}{\gamma}||\nabla v||^2_{L^2(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\right),$$

for all $0<r<\frac{1}{2}$ and one easily extends this to all $0<r<1$ by taking C_N bigger if necesary. From this, by simple calculations we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u(r)-u(\frac{r}{2})|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v(r)-v(\frac{r}{2})| &\leq \int_{r/2}^r\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u_r(t)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v_r(t)|\right)t^{\frac{N-1}{2}}t^{\frac{1-N}{2}}dt\\
&\leq \sqrt{2}\left(\int_{r/2}^r\left(\frac{u_r^2(t)}{\lambda}+\frac{v_r^2(t)}{\gamma}\right)t^{N-1}dt\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_{r/2}^r t^{1-N}dt\right)^{1/2}\\
&\leq C_N r^{\sqrt{N-1}+2-\frac{N}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||\nabla u||_{L^2(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||\nabla v||_{L^2(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $0<r\leq 1$. Then, there exist $m\in N$ and $1/2<r_1\leq 1$ such that $r=\frac{r_1}{2^{m-1}}$. Since u,v are radial, we have $u(r_1)\leq ||u||_{L^\infty(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\leq C_N||u||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}$ and $v(r_1)\leq ||v||_{L^\infty(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\leq C_N||v||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u(r)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v(r)| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u(r_1)-u(r)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v(r_1)-v(r)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u(r_1)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v(r_1)|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\sum_{i=1}^{m-1}\left|u\left(\frac{r_1}{2^{i-1}}\right)-u\left(\frac{r_1}{2^i}\right)\right|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\sum_{i=1}^{m-1}\left|v\left(\frac{r_1}{2^{i-1}}\right)-v\left(\frac{r_1}{2^i}\right)\right|\\
&\quad+\frac{C_N}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||u||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{C_N}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||v||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\\
&\leq C_N\sum_{i=1}^{m-1}\left(\frac{r_1}{2^{i-1}}\right)^{-N/2+\sqrt{N-1}+2}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||\nabla u||_{L^2(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||\nabla v||_{L^2(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\right)\\
&\quad+\frac{C_N}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||u||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{C_N}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||v||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\\
&\leq C_N\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1}\left(\frac{r_1}{2^{i-1}}\right)^{-N/2+\sqrt{N-1}+2}+1\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||u||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||v||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the sign of $\sqrt{N-1}+2-\frac{N}{2}$ is crucial in getting estimates. Since $\sqrt{N-1}+2-\frac{N}{2}=0$ if and only if $N=10$, this dimension is the critical dimension. From the above, for any $0<r\leq 1$ we get if $2\leq N<10$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u(r)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v(r)|\leq C_N\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||u||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||v||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\right),$$

if $N=10$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u(r)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v(r)|\leq C_N(1+|\log r|)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||u||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||v||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\right),$$

if $N>10$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}|u(r)|+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}|v(r)|\leq C_N r^{-\frac{N}{2}+\sqrt{N-1}+2}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}||u||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}||v||_{H^1(B_1\setminus\overline{B_{1/2}})}\right).$$

Passing to limits we obtain the desired estimates for u^*, v^*.

$\square$

3 Explicit nonlinearities

We now examine the case of polynomial nonlinearities and for this we recall the definition $t_+(p) = p + \sqrt{p(p-1)}$ and note that t_+ is increasing on $[1,\infty)$. We begin with the gradient system.

Theorem 4. *Let $f(u) = (u+1)^p, g(v) = (v+1)^q$ and suppose $p, q > 2$.*

1. *Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$. Then the associated extremal solution of $(G)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$ is bounded provided*

$$\frac{N}{2} < 1 + \frac{2}{p+q-2} \max\{t_+(p-1), t_+(q-1)\}. \tag{13}$$

2. *Let $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$ and define $I_{p,q,\lambda,\gamma}(t) := p+q-1-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}+\frac{2pq}{p+q}\left((\frac{\gamma q}{\lambda p})^{t+q-1}-1\right)$. Let $t_0 := \max\{t_+(p-1), t_+(q-1)\}$ and suppose that $I_{p,q,\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(t_0) > 0$ and $I_{q,p,\gamma^*,\lambda^*}(t_0) > 0$.*

   The map $t \mapsto \min\{I_{p,q,\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(t), I_{q,p,\gamma^*,\lambda^*}(t)\}$ is decreasing and has a root in (t_0, ∞), which we denote by T. Suppose

$$\frac{N}{2} < 1 + \frac{2}{p+q-2} T. \tag{14}$$

   Then the associated extremal solution of $(G)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$ is bounded.

Remark 2. *Note that the condition on t_0 from the second part of Theorem 4 is really a condition on how close the parameters (λ^*, γ^*) are to the "diagonal" given by $\lambda^* p = \gamma^* q$. On the diagonal one trivially sees the condition is satisfied. Some algebra shows that the condition is satisfired provided (λ^*, γ^*) lie within the cone*

$$\left(1 - \frac{p+q}{2pq}[p+q-1-\max\{p-1, q-1\}]\right)^{\frac{1}{t_0+q-1}} < \frac{\gamma^* q}{\lambda^* p} < \left(1 - \frac{p+q}{2pq}[p+q-1-\max\{p-1, q-1\}]\right)^{-\frac{1}{t_0+p-1}}.$$

Theorem 5. *Let $f(u) = (u+1)^p$, $g(v) := (v+1)^q$ with $p, q > 1$.*

Suppose

$$N < \min\left\{4 + \frac{2}{p-1} + 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}}, 4 + \frac{2}{q-1} + 2\sqrt{\frac{q}{q-1}}\right\},$$

and $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$. Then the associated extremal solution of $(H)_{\lambda^*,\gamma^*}$ is bounded.

Remark 3. *Note that $p \mapsto 4 + \frac{2}{p-1} + 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{p-1}}$ is decreasing and goes to 6 as $p \to \infty$. Hence for $N \le 6$ we see all extremal solutions are bounded for any p, q. As in the case of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ one can obtain better results provided they restrict the range of the parameters (λ, γ) to a certain cone with axis given by $\frac{\gamma}{\lambda} = \frac{q}{p}$, we omit the details.*

We begin with some pointwise comparison results.

Lemma 3. *Let $f(u) = (u+1)^p$ and $g(v) = (v+1)^q$ where $p, q > 1$.*

1. *Suppose that (u, v) is a smooth solution of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ where $\lambda p \ge \gamma q$. Then $v \le u \le \frac{\lambda p}{\gamma q} v$.*

2. *Suppose (u, v) is the smooth minimal solution of $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ where $q\lambda \ge \gamma p$. Then $p\gamma u \ge q\lambda v$.*

Proof: (1) Subtracting two equations of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ we get

$$\begin{array}{rcl} -\Delta(u-v) & = & (1+u)^{p-1}(1+v)^{q-1}(\lambda p(1+v) - \gamma q(1+u)) \\ & \geq & \gamma q(1+u)^{p-1}(1+v)^{q-1}(v-u) \end{array}$$

multiply both sides of the above with $(u-v)_-$ to get $\int |\nabla(u-v)_-|^2 \leq 0$ and therefore $v \leq u$. Now, multiply the second equation of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ with $\frac{\lambda p}{\gamma q}$ and again subtract two equations to get

$$-\Delta(u - \frac{\lambda p}{\gamma q} v) = \lambda p(1+u)^{p-1}(1+v)^{q-1}(v-u) \leq 0$$

From maximum principle we get $u \leq \frac{\lambda p}{\gamma q} v$.
(2) Set $K(x) := (u+1)^{p-1}(v+1)^{q-1}$. First note that

$$L(u-v) := -\Delta(u-v) - \gamma p K(x)(u-v) = K(x)((\lambda q - \gamma p)u + \lambda q - \gamma p),$$

and note that the right hand side is nonnegative. If we can show that L satisfies the maximum principle then we'd have $u - v \geq 0$.

We now assume that (u,v) is the smooth minimal solution of $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ and additional we assume that $(\lambda,\gamma) \in \mathcal{U} \backslash \Upsilon$. By Theorem A there is some $\eta \geq 0$ and $\psi > 0$ such that

$$-\Delta\psi - qp\gamma K(x)\psi \geq \eta\psi. \tag{15}$$

Since $(\lambda,\gamma) \notin \Upsilon$ one can infact show that $\eta > 0$. Hence the linear operator on the left satisfies the maximum principle. Since $q > 1$ we see that L must also satisfy the maximum principle and hence $u \geq v$. In the case where $(\lambda,\gamma) \in \mathcal{U} \cap \Upsilon$ we pass to the limit along the fixed parameter ray through $(0,0)$ and (λ,γ) and use the above result. Hence we have shown that $u \geq v$. Now set $t := \frac{\lambda q}{\gamma p}$ and then note that

$$-\Delta(u - tv) = K(x)\lambda q((u+1) - (v+1)) \geq 0$$

and hence $u \geq tv$.

□

Before we prove Theorem 4 we need a general energy estimate.

Lemma 4. *Let $f(u) = (u+1)^p$ and $g(v) = (v+1)^q$. Suppose that (u,v) is a semi-stable solution of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ with $s,t \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{\frac{1}{2}\}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & p\left(p-1-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}\right)\int(1+u)^{2t+p-2}(1+v)^q + q\left(q-1-\frac{s^2}{2s-1}\right)\int(1+v)^{2s+q-2}(1+u)^p \\ & +2pq\int(1+u)^{t+p-1}(1+v)^{s+q-1} + p(p-1)\int(1+u)^{p-2}(1+v)^q + q(q-1)\int(1+u)^p(1+v)^{q-2} \\ & +p\frac{t^2}{2t-1}\int(1+u)^{p-1}(1+v)^q + q\frac{s^2}{2s-1}\int(1+u)^p(1+v)^{q-1} \\ & \leq 2p(p-1)\int(1+u)^{t+p-2}(1+v)^q + 2pq\int(1+u)^{t+p-1}(1+v)^{q-1} \\ & +2q(q-1)\int(1+u)^p(1+v)^{s+q-2} + 2pq\int(1+u)^{p-1}(1+v)^{s+q-1} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This is an application of Lemma 1. Take $\phi := (1+u)^t - 1$ and $\psi := (1+v)^s - 1$ in (2), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p(p-1)\int(1+u)^{p-2}(1+v)^q\left((1+u)^t-1\right)^2 + q(q-1)\int(1+v)^{q-2}(1+u)^p\left((1+v)^s-1\right)^2 \\ & +2pq\int(1+u)^{p-1}(1+v)^{q-1}\left((1+u)^t-1\right)\left((1+v)^s-1\right) \\ & \leq \frac{t^2}{\lambda}\int|\nabla u|^2(1+u)^{2t-2} + \frac{s^2}{\gamma}\int|\nabla v|^2(1+v)^{2s-2} \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Multiply the first and the second equation of $(G)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ with $(1+u)^{2t-1}-1$ and $(1+v)^{2s-1}-1$, respectively, to get

$$(2t-1)\int|\nabla u|^2(1+u)^{2t-2}=\lambda p\int(1+u)^{2t+p-2}(1+v)^q-\lambda p\int(1+u)^{p-1}(1+v)^q$$

and

$$(2s-1)\int|\nabla v|^2(1+v)^{2s-2}=\gamma q\int(1+v)^{2s+q-2}(1+u)^p-\gamma q\int(1+v)^{q-1}(1+u)^p.$$

Using these identities and (16) finishes the proof.

□

Proof of Theorem 4. (1) Let $(\lambda^*,\gamma^*)\in\Upsilon$ and let (u,v) denote a smooth minimal solution on the ray Γ_σ where $\sigma:=\frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$.

Let $1<t<t_+(p-1)$ and $1<s<t_+(q-1)$ in Lemma 4 to arrive at an inequality of the form

$$\int(u+1)^{2t+p-2}(v+1)^q+\int(u+1)^p(v+1)^{2s+q-2}\le C_{t,s}.$$

First note that

$$\int|\nabla u|^2\le p\lambda^*\int(u+1)^p(v+1)^q\le C_{t,s},$$

provided $p<2t_+(p-1)+p-2$ but this holds since $p>1$ and by passing to the limit we see that $u^*\in H_0^1(\Omega)$. We similarly show that $v^*\in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Without loss of generality assume that $p\ge q$ and hence $t_+(q-1)\le t_+(p-1)$ and so we have

$$\int(u+1)^{2t+p+q-2}\le C_t,$$

for all $1<t<t_+(p-1)$. We now re-write the equation as

$$\frac{-\Delta u^*}{\lambda^*}=c(x)u^*+p(v^*+1)^q,$$

where

$$0\le c(x)=p\frac{\left((u^*+1)^{p-1}-1\right)}{u^*}(v^*+1)^q\le C(u^*+1)^{p+q-2}.$$

We now apply regularity theory to see that u^* is bounded provided $c(x),(v^*+1)^q\in L^T$ for some $T>\frac{N}{2}$. But this holds provided

$$(p+q-2)\frac{N}{2}<2t_+(p-1)+p+q-2,$$

which is the desired result. To see v^* is bounded we now use the pointwise comparison between u and v and pass to the limit along the ray Γ_σ.

(2) In (1) we only used the first two integrals from Lemma 4 to obtain estimates. In this part we also use the third integral. Let $(\lambda^*,\gamma^*)\in\mathcal{U}$ and let (u,v) denote the a minimal solution on the ray Γ_σ, where $\sigma:=\frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$. The exact proof depends on the sign of $\lambda^*p-\gamma^*q$ and we suppose that $\lambda^*p\ge\gamma^*q$. Let $t_0<t<T$ and so $I_{p,q,\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(t),I_{q,p,\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(t)>0$ and $p-1-\frac{t^2}{2t-1},q-1-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}<0$. We now set $s=t$ and examine the estimate from Lemma 4. Note the coefficients in front of the first two integrals are negative and the coefficient in front of the third integral is positive. The other integrals on the left are lower order terms which we drop. Now note that $u\ge v$ and so we can replace, since the coefficients are negative, the u's in the first two integrals from the estimate in Lemma 4 with v's. In the third integral we use the fact that

$\frac{\gamma q}{\lambda p}(u+1) \le v+1$. Writing this all out and then again using the fact that we can compare u and v, one can see that the following is a lower bound for the left-hand side of the integral estimate given by Lemma 4,

$$\left(p\left(p-1-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}\right) + q\left(q-1-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}\right) + 2pq\left(\frac{\gamma q}{\lambda p}\right)^{t+q-1}\right) \int (1+u)^{2t+p+q-2}$$
$$+(p+q)\left(p+q-1-\frac{t^2}{2t-1} + \frac{2pq}{p+q}\left(\left(\frac{\gamma q}{\lambda p}\right)^{t+q-1} - 1\right)\right) \int (1+u)^{2t+p+q-2}.$$

Combining everything gives an estimate of the form

$$I_{p,q,\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(t) \int (1+u)^{2t+p+q-2} \le C_{p,q,\lambda^*,\gamma^*} \int (1+u)^{t+p+q-2}.$$

Since $I_{p,q,\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(t) > 0$ we have an estimate. We now proceed exactly as in the first part. We rewrite the equation in the alternate form and we then require that

$$(p+q-2)\frac{N}{2} < 2t+p+q-2,$$

for some $t_0 < t$ where $I_{p,q,\lambda^*,\gamma^*}(t) > 0$.

□

Lemma 5. *Let* $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$.

and let (u,v) *denote a minimal solution of* $(H)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ *on the ray* Γ_σ *where* $\sigma = \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$. *Then for* $1 < t < t_+(p)$ *and* $1 < \tau < t_+(q)$ *we have*

1. $$\int (u+1)^{2t+p-1}(v+1)^{q-1} \le C,$$
2. $$\int (u+1)^{p-1}(v+1)^{2\tau+q-1} \le C,$$
3. $$\int (u+1)^{p+t-1}(v+1)^{q+\tau-1} \le C,$$

where C *is uniform on the ray* Γ_σ.

Proof. Set $\phi := (u+1)^t - 1$ and $\psi := (v+1)^\tau - 1$ and put these into the stability inequality given by (3) to arrive at an inequality of the form

$$\begin{aligned} q(p-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}) \int (u+1)^{2t+p-1}(v+1)^{q-1} \quad &+ \quad p(q-\frac{\tau^2}{2\tau-1}) \int (u+1)^{p-1}(v+1)^{q+2\tau-1} \\ +2\sqrt{p(p-1)q(q-1)} \int (u+1)^{p+t-1}(v+1)^{q+\tau-1} & \\ &\le \quad C(p,q) \int (u+1)^{p+t-1}(v+1)^{q-1} \\ &\quad\; +C(p,q) \int (u+1)^{p-1}(v+1)^{q+\tau-1} \end{aligned}$$

and note that for the given choices of t, τ the coefficients on the left are positive. One now easily sees that the terms on the right are lower order terms and hence we obtain the desired estimates after some standard calculations.

□

Proof of Theorem 5. Without loss of generality we suppose that $\lambda^* q \ge \gamma^* p$. Let (u,v) denote a minimal solution on the ray Γ_σ where $\sigma := \frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda^*}$. Note that we have $u \ge \frac{\lambda^* q}{\gamma^* p} v > v$. We first show that $u^* \in H_0^1$. First note that

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 = \lambda q \int (u+1)^p u (v+1)^{q-1},$$

along the ray Γ_σ and the right hand side is uniformly bounded provided

$$p+1 < p-1+2t_1^+(p),$$

which is the case, for any $p>1$ and dimension N, after considering the estimates from Lemma 5. We now rewrite the equation for u^* as

$$-\Delta u^* = \lambda q \left(\frac{(u^*+1)^p - 1}{u^*} \right) (v^*+1)^{q-1} u^* + \lambda q (v^*+1)^{q-1},$$

and to show u^* is bounded it is sufficient to show that $(u^*+1)^{p-1}(v^*+1)^{q-1} \in L^r$ for some $r > \frac{N}{2}$. Using Lemma 5 one sees this is the case provided

$$\frac{N}{2}(p-1) < p-1+t_+(p), \qquad \frac{N}{2}(q-1) < q-1+t_+(q).$$

So we have shown that u^* is bounded and we now use the fact that $u^* \ge v^*$ to see the same for v^*.

□

References

[1] H. Brezis, T. Cazenave, Y. Martel, A. Ramiandrisoa; *Blow up for $u_t - \Delta u = g(u)$ revisited*, Adv. Diff. Eq., 1 (1996) 73-90.

[2] H. Brezis and L. Vazquez, *Blow-up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid 10 (1997), no. 2, 443–469.

[3] X. Cabré, *Regularity of minimizers of semilinear elliptic problems up to dimension four*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 63 (2010), no. 10, 1362-1380.

[4] X. Cabré and A. Capella, *Regularity of radial minimizers and extremal solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Funct. Anal. 238 (2006), no. 2, 709–733.

[5] C. Cowan, *Regularity of the extremal solutions in a Gelfand system problem*, Advanced Nonlinear Studies, Vol. 11, No. 3 , p. 695 Aug., 2011.

[6] C. Cowan, P. Esposito and N. Ghoussoub, *Regularity of extremal solutions in fourth order nonlinear eigenvalue problems on general domains.* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 28 (2010), no. 3, 10331050.

[7] M.G. Crandall and P.H. Rabinowitz, *Some continuation and variation methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 58 (1975), pp.207-218.

[8] P. Esposito, N. Ghoussoub, Y. Guo; *Mathematical Analysis of Partial Differential Equations Modeling Electrostatic MEMS*, Research Monograph, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 20. Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. xiv+318 pp.

[9] P. Esposito, N. Ghoussoub and Y. Guo, *Compactness along the branch of semi-stable and unstable solutions for an elliptic problem with a singular nonlinearity*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **60** (2007), 1731–1768.

[10] M. Fazly, N. Ghoussoub, *De Giorgi type results for elliptic systems*, To appear in Calc. Var. & PDE.

[11] N. Ghoussoub and Y. Guo, *On the partial differential equations of electro MEMS devices: stationary case*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 38 (2007), 1423-1449.

[12] F. Mignot, J-P. Puel; *Sur une classe de problemes non lineaires avec non linearite positive, croissante, convexe*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 5 (1980) 791-836.

[13] M. Montenegro, *Minimal solutions for a class of elliptic systems*, Bull. London Math. Soc.**37** (2005) 405-416.

[14] G. Nedev, *Regularity of the extremal solution of semilinear elliptic equations,* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. I Math. 330 (2000), no. 11, 997–1002.

[15] S. Villegas, *Sharp estimates for semi-stable radial solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, Journal of Functional Analysis 262 (2012) 3394-3408.